

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 9-16 have been amended. Claim 18 is new. Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending, and rejected claims 1-17. Claims 9-16 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-18 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

## OBJECTIONS

The title is objected to as being non-descriptive. The title has been amended to recite "ELECTRONIC CIRCUIT DESIGN APPARATUS USING COMPONENT CONTOUR INFORMATION AND METHOD THEREOF". Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-16 are objected to for various informalities. Claims 9-16 have been amended per the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

## REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikuchi. Kikuchi discusses the compaction of components on a printed circuit board. The present claims are to a design apparatus that performs the design by calculating the contour of a component region on a printed circuit board.

Claim 1, 9 and 17 are similar claims. The arguments made below as to claim 1 apply as well to claims 9 and 17. Claim 1 recites in part a "calculation device to obtain contour information about the plurality of components from the storage device and to calculate a contour of a component region for collectively arranging the plurality of components using the obtained contour information and the indicated layout distance." Kikuchi discusses a "power supply and ground layer plane while the component contours are arranged on a component contour layer plane." Column 8 lines 3-5. The "arrangement of components on a component contour layer plane" is not a calculation of a contour of a "component region for collectively arranging the plurality of components using the obtained contour information." Kikuchi does not teach or suggest the calculation of a contour of a component region.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, claims 1, 9 and 17 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable from Kikuchi.

Claims 2 and 10 are similar claims. The arguments as to claim 2 apply likewise to claim 10. Claim 2 recites in part “the indication device indicates a component region to be transformed; the calculation device transforms the indicated component region; and the display device displays a transformed component region.” Kikuchi discusses a “movable distance of each component is determined so that the arrangement of the components is uniformly compacted. Thus, compaction is carried out in the manner such that a positional relationship between the components in longitudinal and lateral directions is maintained. It is thus possible to prevent occurrence of the interference upon compaction.” Column 5 lines 19-26. Kikuchi does not disclose an indication device indicating a component region to be transformed.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, claims 2 and 10 are patentably distinguishable from Kikuchi.

Claim 3 recites in part “the indication device indicates a component region to which attribute information is set.” Kikuchi does not discuss the indication of a region, but a “pair of adjacent component terminals adjacent in a longitudinal or a lateral direction.” Column 5 lines 4 and 5.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, claims 3 and 11 are patentably distinguishable from Kikuchi.

Claims 6, 8, 14 and 16 are patentably distinguishable from Kikuchi for the reasons argued above.

### **REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5, 7, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kikuchi in view of Aubel. Claims 5, 7, 13, and 15 are dependent claims of independent claims 1 and 11. As argued in the traversal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections, claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguishable as Kikuchi does not teach or suggest the calculation of a contour of a component region. Aubel further does don't teach or suggest the calculation of a contour of a component region and therefore the combination of Kikuchi and Aubel fails to teach or suggest ever element of the rejected claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM**

Claim 18 is new. Support for the claim found on page 13, lines 4-8 of the disclosure. The prior art not disclosing a component region determined by the type and number of components.

**SUMMARY**

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-18 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 8, 2006

By: /James J. Livingston/  
James J. Livingston  
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501